

Certificate of Mailing or Transmission

I, the undersigned, hereby certify that this correspondence along with other possible documents has been electronically transmitted to the USPTO through its own EFS filing system on November 23, 2009.

Typed Name: Kevin D. McCarthy  
Date: November 23, 2009

Patent 0-05-109 - 15408/US/02

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Inventor: Bar-Yaakov et al.  
Serial no.: 10/541,668  
371(c) date: December 27, 2005  
I.A. Filed: January 12, 2004  
Title: FLAME RETARDANT FOR ENGINEERING  
THERMOPLASTIC APPLICATIONS  
Examiner: Megan MCCULLEY  
Art Unit: 1796  
Confirmation: 4122

---

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir/Madam:

DO NOT ENTER: /M.M./

After-Final Response and Amendment

This response is being submitted in reply to the office action mailed on October 28, 2009.

Amendments

1. Please amend the claims as shown on the attached pages. Method claim 22 has been converted to the main claim, whereas original product claims 1-4 have been rendered dependent from the new main claim.

Currently amended claim 22 has been further amended to make the wording describing the reaction steps clearer; the step "providing low molecular..." is supported in the specification, at Example 1 on pages 6 to 7.

All other amendments, in claims 1-4, 6-10, and 20-22 are formal corrections intended to improve clarity of the text, without incorporating any new matter.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC §102

2. Claims 1, 3, 4, 6-10, and 21 were rejected as being anticipated by Nantaku et al. (JP 2001-310990).

Although differing with the Examiner on the relevancy of Nantaku, the Applicant now amends the set of claim so that the above rejected claims depend from claim 22, which is now converted to the new main claim. As original claim 22 was acknowledged by the Examiner to be novel in relation to Nantaku, it is believed that the subject matter of claims 1, 3, 4, 6-10, and 21 is also novel.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC §103, Claim 22

3. Claim 22 was rejected as being unpatentable over Nakai et al. (US 5,250,590) in view of Nantaku et al. (JP 2001-310990).